

REMARKS

Claims 17-24 and 27-38 are pending in the present application. By this amendment, claims 17, 27, and 28 have been amended and claims 25 and 26 have been canceled, the subject matter of these canceled claims being incorporated into independent claim 17. All of the remaining pending claims have been rejected.

Claims 17-18, 29, 30, 33-34, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lueker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,130,896). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection based on the following reasons.

In rejecting independent claim 17, the Office Action asserts that Lueker et al. discloses all of the features of this claim. Claim 17, as amended, now includes features from canceled claims 25 and 26. These canceled claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lueker et al. in view of Propp et al. Thus, in responding to the rejection of claim 17, the Applicants traverse both the rejection of claim 17 and claims 25 and 26 as follows.

Claim 17 features “a control unit configured to control data communication between the cordless communication devices and produce a connection to an external communication network..” In contrast, neither Lueker or Propp specifically teaches a control unit having the claimed features. In particular, the Office Action asserts that Propp teaches the claimed control unit. This reference, however, merely teaches a controller 202 that performs local power line network management and control functions such as local address allocation and management, administering network access, local network monitoring, and high speed multiplexing to and from higher level switching systems. (See col. 3, line 65 – col. 4, line 10). Propp lacks any teaching, however, that the controller 202 controls data communication between cordless communication devices and produces a connection to an external communication network. Furthermore, neither Lueker or Propp teach or suggest an external communication network. Thus, it would not even be obvious to have including the control unit as claimed with the combination of these references. Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, either combined or separately, do not teach all of the claimed features of claim 17 and the rejection should be withdrawn, accordingly.

With respect to claims 18, 29, and 30, these claims are believed to be allowable on the merits and at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 17, discussed above.

Again with respect to claims 33, 34, and 37, the present Office Action did not indicate specifically how these claims are allegedly anticipated by Lueker et al. Notwithstanding, independent claims 33 and 37 are not anticipated by Lueker. Specifically, with respect to claim 33, this claim features “first and second cordless communication devices in respective first and second communication cells separated from each other by a wall, the first and second communication devices being connected to each other via a power supply network permitting broadband data transmission via the power supply network between the first and second cordless communication devices.” Lueker fails to teach this feature, merely teaching access points (loosely akin to communication cells as shown in FIG. 6A, for example) connected with a powerline but with no connection of cordless communication devices via the power line. Further with respect to claim 37, this claim features “connecting the first and second cordless communication devices together via a power supply network which also supplies power to the first and second communication devices.” Lueker fails to actually teach this claimed feature. Accordingly, the rejections of claims 33 and 37 should be withdrawn.

Additionally, with respect to claim 34, this claim is believed to be allowable at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 33.

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lueker in view of Häammerling et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,443,786). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that this claim is allowable on the merits and at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 17, discussed above.

Claims 20 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lueker in view of Häammerling et al., and further in view of Scifres. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that these claims are allowable on their merits and at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 17, discussed above.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lueker in view of Baum et al.. The Applicants respectfully submit that this claim is allowable on the merits and is further allowable by virtue of its dependency on independent claim 17.

Claims 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lueker et al. in view of Häammerling et al., and further in view of Sakanaka et al. The Applicants

respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that these claims are allowable on their merits and at least by virtue of their ultimate dependency on independent claim 17.

Claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lueker et al. in view of Hä默ling et al., and further in view of Farber et al. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submits that this claim is allowable on its merits and at least by virtue of its ultimate dependency on independent claim 17.

Claims 25-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lueker et al. in view of Propp et al. Concerning remaining claims 27 and 28, the Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that these claims are allowable on the merits and at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 17.

Claims 31-32 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lueker et al in view of White et al. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that claims 31-32 and 35 are allowable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies on independent claims 17 and 33, which were discussed previously.


Claims 36 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lueker et al. in view of Hä默ling et al. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because, as discussed previously, neither of these references teach or suggest broadband communication. Accordingly, these claims are submitted to be allowable on their merits and based at least on their dependency on claims 33 and 37, respectively.

In light of the foregoing comments the Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance and request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY


Patrick B. Law
Reg. No. 41,549
P.O. Box 1135
Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135
Phone: (312) 781-6801

Dated: July 12, 2004